

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. According to the Examiner:

In claims 1-2 and 18-19, the notations in formula (I) are not clearly defined. The notations X_2 , X_4 , Z_3 , Z_5 , and R_1 should be clearly defined. These notations are confusing with notations X, Z and R.

The word "may" should be changed to --optionally--to have more positive citation.

In Claim 12, the notations R_4 and R_5 are not defined.

In Claim 13, the position "1" is not defined in formula (I).

In Claim 18, the notations R_1 and R_2 are not defined.

Claims 3-11, 14-17 and 20-27 are rejected because they are dependent claims.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 12, 18 and 19 overcome the lack of clarity. The amendment to these claims is believed to overcome the rejection of claim 13.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the subject application to Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 25,518

Arthur E. Kluegel/dlm
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-2625
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.